

IN THE DRAWINGS:

Please replace Fig. 2 and Fig. 4 with the attached replacement sheets in which pack main body 201 (Fig. 2) and printer 100 (Fig.4) have been labeled.

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated October 17, 2005. Claims 1 to 7, 9 and 10 remain in the application. Claim 8 has been canceled and Claims 1 and 9 have been amended and are the independent claims herein. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

The drawings were objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.84(p)(4) for allegedly using multiple reference characters to represent the same part, as well as using a single reference character to represent different parts. Specifically, the Office Action alleged that both "503" and "530" were used to denote a subtank, that both "100" and "201" were used to denote a main body, and that reference character "100" was used to designate both a printer and a main body.

In this regard, the specification has been amended to correct the error on page 33, line 19, specifically to change "subtank 503" to "subtank 530". The objection to the use of reference characters "100" and "201" to designate a main body is respectfully traversed, for the reason that the specification indicates that "100" and "201" refer to different main bodies. In particular, on page 16, line 10, reference character "100" refers to a "device" main body, while on page 13, line 26, reference character "201" refers to a "pack" main body of the media pack 200. Nonetheless, for purposes of clarification, the specification has been amended so as to remove the reference character "100" following "the device main body" on page 16, line 10. Thus, reference character "100" now refers only to printer 100. In this regard, this amendment is also seen to address the Office Action's objection to reference character "100" being used to refer to both a printer and a main body. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these objections are therefore respectfully requested.

The drawings were also objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.84(p)(5) for allegedly failing to include reference characters mentioned in the description. Specifically, the Office Action alleged that printer label "100" was not shown in Figure 4, that pack main body label "201" was not shown in Figure 2, and that joint lifter label "405" was not shown in Figure 6. In this regard, replacement sheets for Figures 2 and 4 are submitted herewith bearing the proper labels. In regards to Figure 6, page 20 indicates that the joint lifter is not to be shown in the drawings. Thus, the specification has been amended so as to remove the reference character "405" following "the joint lifter" on page 21, line 4. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these objections are therefore respectfully requested.

The specification was objected to for an informality. Specifically, on page 15, lines 15 and 18 recited "medial pack" rather than "media pack." In this regard, the specification has been amended so as to correct the errors. Withdrawal of this objection is therefore respectfully requested.

The specification was also objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.75(d)(1) for allegedly failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. Specifically, the Office Action interpreted Claims 1 and 9 to perform all of the functional limitations regarding the measuring means and supplying means regardless of whether one of the limitations has been met, thus rendering the claims unclear. Claims 1 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for alleged indefiniteness, under essentially the same reasoning.

The objection and rejections are respectfully traversed, as Applicants fail to see how the decision structures of Claims 1 and 9 are unclear. Nonetheless, without conceding the correctness of the objection or rejections, and solely in an effort to advance prosecution, Claims 1 and 9 have been amended in accordance with the Examiner's

proposals during a telephone conversation dated October 13, 2005. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection and the rejections are therefore respectfully requested.

Claim 8 was objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.75(c) for allegedly failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Without conceding the correctness of the objection, Claim 8 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. Withdrawal of this objection is therefore respectfully requested.

No other matters being raised, it is believed that the entire application is fully in condition for allowance, and such action is courteously solicited.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael K. O'Neill
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No.: 32,622

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200